10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Gerald F. Cranford**,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 95–9891 Filed 4–20–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

# Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of the OMB review of information collection.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC has recently submitted to the OMB for review the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

- 1. Type of submission, new, revision or extension: New.
- 2. The title of the information collection: NRC Survey: Handling of Your Concern.
- 3. The form number if applicable: NRC Form 592.
- 4. How often the collection is required: Twice only (initial survey and a followup survey).
- 5. Who will be required or asked to report: Individuals who have submitted allegations to the NRC.
- 6. An estimate of the number of responses: 200.
- 7. An estimate of average burden per response: 20 minutes.
- 8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed to complete the requirement or request: 67.

9. An indication of whether Section 3504(h), Pub. L. 96–511 applies: Not applicable.

10. Abstract: NRC plans to conduct a voluntary survey of individuals who have submitted allegations to the NRC to determine the effectiveness of its existing program and to develop training to address identified deficiencies.

Copies of the submittal may be inspected or obtained for a fee from the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20555.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer: Troy

Hillier, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150- ), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda J. Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of April, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Gerald F. Cranford**,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 95–9892 Filed 4–20–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

#### [Docket No. 50-278]

PECO Energy Company Public Service Electric and Gas Company Delmarva Power and Light Company, Atlantic City Electric Company, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission (the Commission) is
considering issuance of an exemption
from the requirements of Sections
III.D.2.(a) and III.D.3 of Appendix J to 10
CFR Part 50, to PECO Energy Company,
Public Service Electric and Gas
Company, Delmarva Power and Light
Company, and Atlantic City Electric
Company (the licensee), for the Peach
Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS),
Unit 3, located at the licensee's site in
York County, Pennsylvania.

### **Environmental Assessment**

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant an exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections III.D.2.(a) and III.D.3. Section III.D.2.(a) states, in part: "Type B tests, except tests for air locks, shall be performed during reactor shutdown for refueling, or other convenient intervals, but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years." Section III.D.3 states: "Type C tests shall be performed during each reactor shutdown for refueling but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years." The exemption would allow a one-time 60day extension of the 2-year requirement. Hence, this exemption would allow the licensee to perform the testing in Sections III.D.2.(a) and III.D.3 during Unit 3's Cycle 10 refueling outage scheduled to begin no later than September 30, 1995.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated February 22, 1995.

Need for the Proposed Action

PBAPS, Unit 3 is utilizing a new core design which allows the intervals between reactor shutdowns for refueling to extend beyond the maximum allowable 2-year interval. Prior to the current operating cycle, local leak rate tests were performed in conjunction with an operating cycle of 18 months. Use of extended cycle core designs has been recognized as a growing trend in the industry as discussed in the staff's Generic Letter 91–04, "Changes in **Technical Specification Surveillance** Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle," dated April 2, 1991. The staff previously granted the licensee license amendments to allow PBAPS, Unit 3 to perform selected surveillances on a 24-month interval (see Amendment 173 dated August 19, 1992, and Amendment 182 dated August 2, 1993). However, the regulations cited by the licensee in the exemption request have not been revised to reflect the use of a 24-month operating cycle. Therefore, the licensee has requested an exemption in order to avoid a premature shutdown which would be needed to accomplish the testing and to properly schedule the testing during the refueling outage.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed the evaluation of the proposed exemption and concludes that this action would not significantly increase the probability or amount of expected primary containment leakage; hence, the containment integrity would be maintained.

Based on the information presented in the licensee's application, the proposed extended test interval would not result in a non-detectable leakage rate in excess of the value established by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, or in any changes to the containment structure or plant systems. Consequently, the probability of accidents would not be increased, nor would the post-accident radiological releases be greater than previously determined. Neither would the proposed exemption otherwise affect radiological plant effluents. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no measurable environmental affects that would result from the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemption. This would not reduce environmental impacts of plant operation and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

## Alternate Use of Resources

This proposed action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, dated April 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

The staff consulted with the State of Pennsylvania regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State Official had no comment.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for exemption dated February 22, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the local public document room located at Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (Regional Depository) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of April 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

#### John F. Stolz,

Director, Project Directorate, I-2 Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–9893 Filed 4–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee Meetings of Subcommittee on Instrumentation and Control (I&C) and Human Factors and Subcommittee on Research in Support of Risk-Based Regulation (PRA Subcommittee)

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory

Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meetings.

The NSRRC I&C and Human Factors Subcommittee will hold a meeting on May 18 and 19, 1995 and the PRA Subcommittee on May 19, 1995. A part of the May 19 meeting will be a joint meeting of the two subcommittees. The meetings will take place in Room T–2B3, Two White Flint North (TWFN) Building, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD.

The meetings will be open to public attendance.

The I&C and Human Factors Subcommittee will review human factors research programs. In the joint meeting, the two subcommittees will jointly review research related to representation of human performance and organizational factors in probabilistic risk assessments. After the joint meeting, the PRA subcommittee will review NRC probabilistic risk assessment policy and practice in relation to research needs.

The agenda will be as follows:

Thursday, May 18: I&C and Human Factors Subcommittee

8:30–10:00 Introduction; overview of human factors research.

10:15–11:45 Human-system interface; safety-related operator actions.

1:00–3:45 Human performance data collection, Halden human error project, communications, simulator training; radiation therapy; staffing projects.
3:45–5:00 Subcommittee discussion.

Friday, May 19: Joint Meeting of Both Subcommittees

8:00–8:30 Introduction, background. 8:30–9:45 Organizational performance measures and methods to include organizational factors in PRA.

10:00–11:45 Human performance measures. 11:45–12:00 Subcommittees discussion.

12:00 I&C and Human Factors Subcommittee adjourns at the conclusion of the joint meeting.

Friday, May 19, continued: PRA Subcommittee

1:15-1:30 Introductory remarks.
1:30-4:00 Update on PRA Policy Statement and PRA Implementation Plan.
4:00-5:00 Subcommittee discussion.

The Subcommittees will report to the full Committee on the facts and analyses discussed at the meetings.

Detailed agenda will be made available at the meetings.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the presiding Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Subcommittee. Questions may be asked only by members of the Committee and the staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff member named below as far in advance as is practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portions of the meetings, the Subcommittees may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting. The Subcommittees will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions, whether the meetings have been canceled or rescheduled, and the Chairmen's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefore can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to Mr. George Sege (telephone 301/415–6593) between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (EST). Persons planning to attend these meetings are urged to contact the above named individual one or two business days before the scheduled meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: April 13 1995.

#### George Sege,

Technical Assistant to the Director Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 95–9895 Filed 4–20–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

#### [Docket No. 50-309]

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity For a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR– 36 issued to Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station located in Lincoln County, Maine.

The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to allow the use of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation sleeving process for repairing steam generator tubes.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.